

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**  
(Case No. 06-225)

In the Application of:	)	
	)	
Russell Vaughan Meddes et al	)	Examiner: James S. Bergin
	)	
Serial No. 10/575,021	)	
	)	Group Art Unit: 3641
Filed: April 7, 2006	)	
	)	Conf. No. 7051
Title: Improvements In And Relating To Perforators )	)	
	)	
Commissioner for Patents		
P.O. Box 1450		
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450		

Sir:

**SUPPLEMENTAL REPLY TO THE NOVEMBER 23, 2009  
RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT**

This is a Supplemental Reply to the November 23, 2009 Restriction Requirement for the above-identified patent application. This Reply removes reference to DE3424867 which was not discussed in the examiner's Restriction Requirement and replaces it with Applicant's position that examining the claims together will not place an excess burden on the examiner.

Claims 1, 10-23, 25 and 27-32 are pending in the application.

**I. THE RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT TRAVERSE**

**A. The Claims Possess A Single Inventive Concept**

The examiner's restriction requirement is traversed because the currently pending claims all possess a single inventive concept. i.e., common special technical features that are unique to the claimed invention. In particular, claim 1 is amended above to direct it to a "liner". As a result, independent claim 1 and all remaining claims, by virtue of their dependence upon claim 1, share at least the common special technical feature of "a liner that includes a first portion and a second portion, the first and second portions comprising different ratios of filler to matrix".

**B. Examining All Pending Claims Together Will Not Place An Excessive Burden On The Examiner By**

There will be no excessive burden placed on the examiner by examining all of the claims together. The Applicant points out that the examiner examined all application claims in an initial examination on August 19, 2008. The claims examined included claim 2 which is essentially identical to pending independent claim 1 except that the claim preamble has been amended to direct identify the invention as a liner instead of as a component. Indeed, original claim 1 – which the examiner had no problems examining was far broader than currently amended application claim 1. Is for at least this reason that the burden to the examiner to perform a search related to the pending claims will be no more burdensome than the examiner's initial search – which was made without a restriction requirement.

**II. THE PROVISIONAL ELECTIONS**

The Applicant provisionally elects to continue with the examination of claims 1, 10-18 and 29-32 directed to the Group I invention, namely a liner.

The Applicant further elects the following species for examination purposes:

- The species of claim 15 wherein the filler is a flake.
- The species of claim 32 wherein the filler is a metallic material.

McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff LLP

Date: March 24, 2010

By: /A. Blair Hughes/  
A. Blair Hughes  
Reg. No. 32,901  
312-913-2123